## REMARKS

A total of 94 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 11, 2007 and the Advisory Action mailed December 10, 2007, wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested. By way of the above-noted amendments, independent claims 1, 41, and 82 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 7, 48 and 89, respectively, and any intervening claims. Claim 67 has been amended for consistency with amended claims 1, 41, and 82. Claims 4-10, 45-51 and 85-92 have been cancelled in view of the above-noted amendments in claims 1, 41 and 82.

Referring now to the text of the Office Action:

- claims 1, 10, 26, 41, 51, 67, 82, 85, 92, 122 and 123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,125,117 (Martin et al.);

- claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 24, 25, 28, 29, 45, 46, 49, 50, 65, 66, 69, 70, 86, 87, 90, 91, 106, 107, 109 and 110 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of United States Patent No. 7,136,377 (Tweedly et al);

- claims 6, 47 and 88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of Tweedly et al, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,477,164 (Vargo et al.);

- claims 11-18, 20-23, 34-39, 52-59, 61-64, 75-80, 93-100, 102-105 and 115-120 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,259,691 (Naudus);

- claims 27, 68 and 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al;

- claims 30, 31, 71, 72, 111, and 112 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of Tweedly et al, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,606, 306 (Lin et al);

- claims 32, 33, 73, 74, 113 and 114 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of United States Patent No. 6,452,950 (Ohlsson et al.);

- claims 40, 81 and 121 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the teaching of Martin et al in view of Naudus, and further in view of Tweedly et al.; and

- claims 7, 48 and 89 stand objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As an initial matter, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7, 48 and 89. The Examiners claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) are believed to be traversed by the above-noted claim amendments. In particular, claims 1, 41 and 82 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 7, 48 and 89, respectively, and any intervening claims. Since claims 7, 48 and 89, have been indicated as allowable, claims 1, 41 and 82 and their dependencies are now believed to be allowable. Claim 67 has been amended in a manner that is consistent with the amendments made in claims 1, 41 and 82. Accordingly, claim 67 and its dependencies are now believed to be allowable.

Favourable reconsideration and issuance of a notice of Allowance are believed to be in order, and such action is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent Daniels/
By: Kent Daniels
Reg. No. 44,206
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: January 10, 2008

Ogilvy Renault LLP
Suite 1600
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3
(613) 780 8673